

RANDOM COVARIANCE MATRICES: UNIVERSALITY OF LOCAL STATISTICS OF EIGENVALUES

TERENCE TAO AND VAN VU

ABSTRACT. We study the eigenvalues values of the covariance matrix $\frac{1}{n}M^*M$ of a large rectangular matrix $M = M_{n,p} = (\zeta_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ whose entries are iid random variables of mean zero, variance one, and having finite C_0^{th} moment for some sufficiently large constant C_0 .

The main result of this paper is a Four Moment Theorem for iid covariance matrices (analogous to the Four Moment Theorem for Wigner matrices established by the authors in [48] (see also [49])). We can use this theorem together with existing results to establish universality of local statistics of eigenvalues under mild conditions.

As a byproduct of our arguments, we also extend our previous results on random Hermitian matrices to the case in which the entries have finite C_0^{th} moment rather than exponential decay.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The model. The main purpose of this paper is to study the asymptotic local eigenvalue statistics of covariance matrices of large random matrices. Let us first fix the matrix ensembles that we will be studying.

Definition 1 (Random covariance matrices). Let n be a large integer parameter going off to infinity, and let $p = p(n)$ be another integer parameter such that $p \leq n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p/n = y$ for some $0 < y \leq 1$. We let $M = M_{n,p} = (\zeta_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ be a random $p \times n$ matrix, whose distribution of course is allowed to depend on n . We say that the matrix ensemble M *obeys condition C1* with some exponent $C_0 \geq 2$ if the random variables ζ_{ij} are jointly independent, have mean zero and variance 1, and obey the moment condition $\sup_{i,j} \mathbf{E}|\zeta_{ij}|^{C_0} \leq C$ for some constant C independent of n, p . We say that the matrix M is *iid* if the ζ_{ij} are identically and independently distributed with law independent of n, p .

Given such a matrix, we form the $n \times n$ *covariance matrix* $W = W_{n,p} := \frac{1}{n}M^*M$. This matrix has rank p and so the first $n - p$ eigenvalues are trivial; we order the (necessarily positive) remaining eigenvalues of these matrices (counting multiplicity) as

$$0 \leq \lambda_1(W) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_p(W).$$

T. Tao is supported by a grant from the MacArthur Foundation, by NSF grant DMS-0649473, and by the NSF Waterman award.

V. Vu is supported by research grants DMS-0901216 and AFOSAR-FA-9550-09-1-0167.

We often abbreviate $\lambda_i(W)$ as λ_i .

Note that the only distributional hypothesis we require on the entries ζ_{ij} , besides the crucial joint independence hypothesis, are moment conditions. In particular, we make no distinction between continuous and discrete distributions here.

Remark 2. In this paper we will focus primarily on the case $y = 1$, but several of our results extend to other values of y as well. The case $p > n$ can of course be deduced from the $p < n$ case after some minor notational changes by transposing the matrix M , which does not affect the non-trivial eigenvalues of the covariance matrix. One can also easily normalise the variance of the entries to be some other quantity σ^2 than 1 if one wishes. Observe that the quantities $\sigma_i := \sqrt{n}\lambda_i^{1/2}$ can be interpreted as the non-trivial singular values of the original matrix M , and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$ can also be interpreted as the eigenvalues of the $p \times p$ matrix $\frac{1}{n}MM^*$. It will be convenient to exploit all three of these spectral interpretations of $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$ in this paper. Condition **C1** is analogous to Condition **C0** for Wigner-type matrices in [48], but with the exponential decay hypothesis relaxed to polynomial decay only.

The well-known *Marchenko-Pastur law* governs the bulk distribution of the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$ of W :

Theorem 3 (Marchenko-Pastur law). *Assume Condition **C1** with $C_0 > 2$, and suppose that $p/n \rightarrow y$ for some $0 < y \leq 1$. Then for any $x > 0$, the random variables*

$$\frac{1}{p} |\{1 \leq i \leq p : \lambda_i(W) \leq x\}|$$

converge in probability to $\int_0^x \rho_{MP,y}(x) dx$, where

$$(1) \quad \rho_{MP,y}(x) := \frac{1}{2\pi xy} \sqrt{(b-x)(x-a)} 1_{[a,b]}(x)$$

and

$$(2) \quad a := (1 - \sqrt{y})^2; \quad b = (1 + \sqrt{y})^2.$$

When furthermore M is iid, one can also obtain the case $C_0 = 2$.

Proof. For the case $C_0 \geq 4$, see [32], [38]; for the case $C_0 > 2$, see [52]; for the $C_0 = 2$ iid case, see [53]. Further results are known on the rate of convergence: see [24]. $\square$

In this paper we are concerned instead with the local eigenvalue statistics. A model case is the (*complex*) *Wishart ensemble*, in which the ζ_{ij} are iid variables which are complex gaussians with mean zero and variance 1. In this case, the distribution of the eigenvalues $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ of W can be explicitly computed (as a special case of the *Laguerre unitary ensemble*). For instance, when $p = n$, the joint distribution is given by the density function

$$(3) \quad \rho_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = c(n) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} |\lambda_i - \lambda_j|^2 \exp(-n \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i)$$

for some explicit normalization constant $c(n)$ whose exact value is not important for this discussion.

Very similarly to the GUE case, one can use this explicit formula to directly compute several local statistics, including the distribution of the largest and smallest eigenvalues [7], the correlation functions [36] etc. Also in similarity to the GUE case, it is widely conjectured that these statistics hold for a much larger class of random matrices. For some earlier results in this direction, we refer to [43, 47, 3, 18] and the references therein.

The goal of this paper is to establish a Four Moment theorem for random covariance matrices, as an analogue of a recent result in [48]. This theorem asserts that all local statistics of the eigenvalues of W_n is determined by the first four moments of the entries.

1.2. The Four Moment Theorem. We first need some definitions.

Definition 4 (Frequent events). [48] Let E be an event depending on n .

- E holds *asymptotically almost surely* if $\mathbf{P}(E) = 1 - o(1)$.
- E holds *with high probability* if $\mathbf{P}(E) \geq 1 - O(n^{-c})$ for some constant $c > 0$ (independent of n).
- E holds *with overwhelming probability* if $\mathbf{P}(E) \geq 1 - O_C(n^{-C})$ for every constant $C > 0$ (or equivalently, that $\mathbf{P}(E) \geq 1 - \exp(-\omega(\log n))$).
- E holds *almost surely* if $\mathbf{P}(E) = 1$.

Definition 5 (Matching). We say that two complex random variables ζ, ζ' *match to order k* for some integer $k \geq 1$ if one has $\mathbf{E}\text{Re}(\zeta)^m \text{Im}(\zeta)^l = \mathbf{E}\text{Re}(\zeta')^m \text{Im}(\zeta')^l$ for all $m, l \geq 0$ with $m + l \leq k$.

Our main result is

Theorem 6 (Four Moment Theorem). *For sufficiently small $c_0 > 0$ and sufficiently large $C_0 > 0$ ($C_0 = 10^4$ would suffice) the following holds for every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $k \geq 1$. Let $M = (\zeta_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ and $M' = (\zeta'_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ be matrix ensembles obeying condition **C1** with the indicated constant C_0 , and assume that for each i, j that ζ_{ij} and ζ'_{ij} match to order 4. Let W, W' be the associated covariance matrices. Assume also that $p/n \rightarrow y$ for some $0 < y \leq 1$.*

Let $G : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function obeying the derivative bounds

$$(4) \quad |\nabla^j G(x)| \leq n^{c_0}$$

for all $0 \leq j \leq 5$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

Then for any $\varepsilon p \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq (1 - \varepsilon)p$, and for n sufficiently large depending on ε, k, c_0 we have

$$(5) \quad |\mathbf{E}(G(n\lambda_{i_1}(W), \dots, n\lambda_{i_k}(W))) - \mathbf{E}(G(n\lambda_{i_1}(W'), \dots, n\lambda_{i_k}(W')))| \leq n^{-c_0}.$$

If ζ_{ij} and ζ'_{ij} only match to order 3 rather than 4, the conclusion (5) still holds provided that one strengthens (4) to

$$|\nabla^j G(x)| \leq n^{-jc_1}$$

for all $0 \leq j \leq 5$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and any $c_1 > 0$, provided that c_0 is sufficiently small depending on c_1 .

This is an analogue of [48, Theorem 15] for covariance matrices, with the main difference being that the exponential decay condition from [48, Theorem 15] has been weakened to the high moment condition in **C1**. This is achieved by an “exponential decay removing trick” that relies on using a truncated version of the four moment theorem to extend the range of validity of a key “gap condition” that is used in the proof of the above theorem. The same trick also allows one to obtain a similar strengthening of the main results of [48, 49], thus relaxing the exponential decay hypotheses in those results to high moment conditions. The value $C_0 = 10^4$ is *ad hoc*, and we make no attempt to optimize this constant.

Remark 7. The reason that we restrict the eigenvalues to the bulk of the spectrum ($\varepsilon p \leq i \leq (1-\varepsilon)p$) is to guarantee that the density function $\rho_{MP,y}$ is bounded away from zero. In view of the results in [49], we expect that the result extends to the edge of the spectrum as well. In particular, in view of the results in [3], it is likely that the hard edge asymptotics of Forrester[19] can be extended to a wider class of ensembles. We will pursue this issue elsewhere.

1.3. Applications. One can apply Theorem 6 in a similar way as its counterpart [48, Theorem 15] in order to obtain universality results for large classes of random matrices. In many cases, one can combine this theorem with existing partial results for special ensembles to remove some of the moment assumptions. Let us demonstrate this through an example concerning the universality of the *sine kernel*.

Using the explicit formula (3), Nagao and Wadati [36] established the following result for the complex Wishart ensemble.

Theorem 8 (Sine kernel for Wishart ensemble). [36] *Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer, let $f : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a continuous function with compact support and symmetric with respect to permutations, and let $0 < u < 4$; we assume all these quantities are independent of n . Assume that¹ $p = n + O(1)$ (thus $y = 1$), and that W is given by the complex Wishart ensemble. Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$ be the non-trivial eigenvalues of W . Then the quantity*

$$(6) \quad \mathbf{E} \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_k \leq p} f(n\rho_{MP,1}(u)\lambda_{i_1}, \dots, n\rho_{MP,1}(u)\lambda_{i_k})$$

converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(t_1, \dots, t_k) \det(K(t_i, t_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq k} dt_1 \dots dt_k$$

where $K(x, y) := \frac{\sin(\pi(x-y))}{\pi(x-y)}$ is the sine kernel.

¹See Section 3.1 for the asymptotic notation we will be using.

Remark 9. The results in [36] allowed f to be bounded measurable rather than continuous, but when we consider discrete ensembles later, it will be important to keep f continuous.

Returning to the bulk, the following extension was established by Ben Arous and Peché [3], as a variant of Johansson's result [27] for random hermitian matrices. We say that a complex random variable ζ of mean zero and variance one is *Gauss divisible* if ζ has the same distribution as $\zeta = (1-t)^{1/2}\zeta' + t^{1/2}\zeta''$ for some $0 < t < 1$ and some independent random variables ζ', ζ'' of mean zero and variance 1, with ζ'' distributed according to the complex gaussian.

Theorem 10 (Sine kernel for Gaussian divisible ensemble). [3] *Theorem 8 (which is for the Wishart ensemble and for $p = n + O(1)$) can be extended to the case when $p = n + O(n^{43/48})$ (so y is still 1), and when M is an iid matrix obeying condition **C1** with $C_0 = 2$, and with the ζ_{ij} gauss divisible.*

Using Theorem 6 and Theorem 10 (in exactly the same way we used [48, Theorem 15] and Johansson's theorem [27] to establish [48, Theorem 11]), we obtain the following result:

Theorem 11 (Sine kernel for more general ensembles). *Theorem 8 can be extended to the case when $p = n + O(n^{43/48})$ (so y is still 1), and when M is an iid matrix obeying condition **C1** with C_0 sufficiently large ($C_0 = 10^4$ would suffice), and with ζ_{ij} have support on at least three points.*

Proof. (Sketch) It was shown in [48, Corollary 30] that if the real and imaginary parts of a complex random variable ζ were independent with mean zero and variance one, and both were supported on at least three points, then ζ matched to order 4 with a gauss divisible random variable ζ' with finite C_0 moment (indeed, if one inspects the convexity argument used to solve the moment problem in [48, Lemma 28], the gauss divisible random variable could be taken to be the sum of a gaussian variable and a discrete variable, and in particular is thus exponentially decaying). If one lets M' be the iid matrix whose coefficients have entries ζ' , then Theorem 10 asserts that the conclusions of Theorem 8 hold for M' . Using Theorem 6 exactly as in the proof of [48, Theorem 11] (and approximating f uniformly by smooth functions), we conclude that the conclusions of Theorem 8 hold for M also. $\square$

The arguments in this paper will be a non-symmetric version of those in [48]. The arguments in [48] started with analyzing the stability of the eigenvalue equation $Mv_i = \lambda_i v_i$ where M is a random Hermitian matrix and λ_i is the i^{th} eigenvalue with eigenvector v . For the situation considered in this paper, it is tempting to similarly analyze the eigenvalue equation $Wv_i = \lambda_i v_i$ for the covariance matrix W . However, this does not work, since the covariance matrix W , while random, does not have independent entries. The new idea here is to work with a system of two equations

$$(7) \quad Mu_i = \sigma_i v_i$$

and

$$(8) \quad M^* v_i = \sigma_i u_i,$$

where u_i and v_i are the left and right singular vectors of M . This leads to a number of technical issues that need to be addressed through the paper.

One can combine the singular value equations (7), (8) into a single eigenvalue equation

$$\mathbf{M} \begin{pmatrix} v_i \\ u_i \end{pmatrix} = \sigma_i \begin{pmatrix} v_i \\ u_i \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\mathbf{M}$ is the *augmented matrix*

$$(9) \quad \mathbf{M} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M \\ M^* & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus one can view the singular values of an iid matrix as being essentially given by the eigenvalues of a slightly larger Hermitian matrix which is of Wigner type except that the entries have been zeroed out on two diagonal blocks. We will take advantage of this augmented perspective in some parts of the paper (particularly when we wish to import results from [48] as black boxes), but in other parts it will in fact be more convenient to work with M directly. In particular, the fact that many of the entries in (9) are zero (and in particular, have zero mean and variance) seems to make it difficult to directly apply parts of the arguments from [48] (particularly those that are probabilistic in nature², rather than deterministic) directly to the augmented matrix, and will instead work with M directly in these cases. Nevertheless one can view this connection as a heuristic explanation as to why some (but not all) of the machinery in the Hermitian eigenvalue problem can be transferred to the non-Hermitian singular value problem.

1.4. Extensions. In a very recent work, Erdős, Schlein, Yau and Yin [14] extended³ Theorem 10 to a large class of matrices, assuming that the distribution of the entries ζ_{ij} is sufficiently smooth and obeys a log-Sobolev inequality. While their results do not apply for entries with discrete distributions, it allows one to extend Theorem 10 to the case when t is a negative power of n . Given this, one can use

²A typical instance of a probabilistic argument that encounters difficulty when there are many zero entries arises when one wants to estimate the distance $\text{dist}(X, V)$ between a random vector $X = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ (which one should think of as something like a row of $\mathbf{M}$) and a fixed subspace V . If all the entries of X are iid with mean zero and constant variance, then an easy second moment computation allows one to control $\mathbf{E} \text{dist}(X, V)^2$ exactly in terms of the codimension of V ; in particular, no knowledge of the orientation of V is required. One also obtains reasonable upper and lower bounds on this quantity if the variance is not constant, but is also bounded above and below. However, if many of the entries of X have zero variance (i.e. they vanish), then one has difficulty lower bounding $\mathbf{E} \text{dist}(X, V)^2$ because one has to somehow exclude the possibility that the normal vectors to V have almost all of their ℓ^2 mass supported on those zero variance entries. We do not know how to address this problem in general. *Note added in proof:* Several months after the submission of this paper, Erdős, Yau, and Yin [16, 17] were able to obtain universality results for some classes of generalized Wigner matrices (such as band matrices) in which some entries are permitted to have zero variance. However, one of their key assumptions is that the matrix of (normalised) variances has a simple eigenvalue at 1, and this assumption does not hold for the augmented matrix (9).

³Even more recently, a similar result was also established by P\'ech\'e[39].

the argument in [15] to remove the requirement that the real and imaginary parts of ζ_{ij} be supported on at least three points.

We can also have the following analogue of [15, Theorem 2].

Theorem 12 (Universality of averaged correlation function). *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and u such that $0 < u - \varepsilon < u + \varepsilon < 4$. Let $k \geq 1$ and let $f : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous, compactly supported function, and let $W = W_{n,n}$ be a random covariance matrix, with n assumed large depending on u, ε, k . Then the quantity*

$$(10) \quad \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_{u-\varepsilon}^{u+\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} f(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \frac{1}{[\rho_{MP,1}(u')]^k} p_n^{(k)}\left(u' + \frac{\alpha_1}{n\rho_{MP,1}(u')}, \dots, u' + \frac{\alpha_k}{n\rho_{MP,1}(u')}\right) d\alpha_1 \dots d\alpha_k du'$$

converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} f(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \det(K(\alpha_i, \alpha_j))_{i,j=1}^k d\alpha_1 \dots d\alpha_k,$$

where $K(x, y)$ is the Dyson sine kernel

$$(11) \quad K(x, y) := \frac{\sin(\pi(x - y))}{\pi(x - y)},$$

and the k -point correlation function $p_n^{(k)} : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is the unique symmetric probability distribution such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} f(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) p_n^{(k)}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) := \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq n} f(\lambda_{i_1}, \dots, \lambda_{i_k})$$

for all test functions f . (If W is a discrete ensemble, one has to interpret $p_n^{(k)}$ as a distribution or a probability measure rather than as a function.)

The details are essentially the same as in [15], and are omitted.

Remark 13. The four moment theorem controls the distribution of individual eigenvalues (or singular values) λ_i , but as indicated above, this control can then be used to obtain control of correlation expressions such as (10). The local relaxation flow methods developed in [9]-[14], by contrast, are focused on individual energy levels u rather than individual eigenvalues. As such, they provide an alternate approach to controlling correlation expressions such as (10), but we do not know how to convert such information back to control on individual eigenvalues or singular values in general, because the standard deviation of each eigenvalue can exceed (by a logarithmic factor, see [26]) the scale of the mean eigenvalue spacing, which is the scale at which the correlation estimates operate at.

1.5. Acknowledgments. We thank Horng-Tzer Yau for references, and the anonymous referee for helpful comments.

2. THE GAP PROPERTY AND THE EXPONENTIAL DECAY REMOVING TRICK

The following property plays an important role in [48].

Definition 14 (Gap property). Let M be a matrix ensemble obeying condition **C1**. We say that M obeys the *gap property* if for every $\varepsilon, c > 0$ (independent of n), and for every $\varepsilon p \leq i \leq (1 - \varepsilon)p$, one has $|\lambda_{i+1}(W) - \lambda_i(W)| \geq n^{-1-c}$ with high probability. (The implied constants in this statement can depend of course on ε and c .)

As an analogue of [48, Theorem 19], we prove the following theorem, using the same method with some modifications.

Theorem 15 (Gap theorem). *Let $M = (\zeta_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ obey condition **C1** for some C_0 , and suppose that the coefficients ζ_{ij} are exponentially decaying in the sense that $\mathbf{P}(|\zeta_{ij}| \geq t^C) \leq \exp(-t)$ for all $t \geq C'$ for all i, j and some constants $C, C' > 0$. Then M obeys the gap property.*

Next, we have the following analogue of [48, Theorem 15].

Theorem 16 (Four Moment Theorem with Gap assumption). *For sufficiently small $c_0 > 0$ and sufficiently large $C_0 > 0$ ($C_0 = 10^4$ would suffice) the following holds for every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $k \geq 1$. Let $M = (\zeta_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ and $M' = (\zeta'_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ be matrix ensembles obeying condition **C1** with the indicated constant C_0 , and assume that for each i, j that ζ_{ij} and ζ'_{ij} match to order 4. Let W, W' be the associated covariance matrices. Assume also that M and M' obeys the gap property, and that $p/n \rightarrow y$ for some $0 < y \leq 1$.*

Let $G : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function obeying the derivative bounds

$$(12) \quad |\nabla^j G(x)| \leq n^{c_0}$$

for all $0 \leq j \leq 5$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

Then for any $\varepsilon p \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq (1 - \varepsilon)p$, and for n sufficiently large depending on ε, k, c_0 we have

$$(13) \quad |\mathbf{E}(G(n\lambda_{i_1}(W), \dots, n\lambda_{i_k}(W))) - \mathbf{E}(G(n\lambda_{i_1}(W'), \dots, n\lambda_{i_k}(W')))| \leq n^{-c_0}.$$

If ζ_{ij} and ζ'_{ij} only match to order 3 rather than 4, the conclusion (13) still holds provided that one strengthens (12) to

$$|\nabla^j G(x)| \leq n^{-jc_1}$$

for all $0 \leq j \leq 5$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and any $c_1 > 0$, provided that c_0 is sufficiently small depending on c_1 .

This theorem is weaker than Theorem 6, as we assume the gap property. Besides the fact that we consider singular values here instead of eigenvalues, the main difference between this result and [48, Theorem 15] is that in the latter we assume exponential decay rather than the gap property. However, this difference is only a formality, since in the proof of [48, Theorem 15], the only place we used exponential decay is to prove the gap property (via [48, Theorem 19]).

The core of the proof of Theorem 16 is a truncated four moment theorem (Theorem 31), which allows us to insert information such as the gap property into the test function G .

By combining Theorem 16 with Theorem 15, we obtain Theorem 6 in the case when the coefficients ζ_{ij} are exponentially decaying. To remove the exponential decay hypothesis, we will apply the truncated four moment theorem (Theorem 31) a second time, together with a moment matching argument (Lemma 33) to eliminate this hypothesis from Theorem 15:

Theorem 17 (Gap theorem). *Assume that $M = (\zeta_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ satisfies condition **C1** with C_0 sufficiently large. Then M obeys the gap property.*

Theorem 6 follows directly from Theorems 16 and 17.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The next three sections are devoted to technical lemmas. The proofs of Theorems 16 and 17 are presented in Section 6, assuming Theorems 31 and 15. The proofs of these latter two theorems are presented in Sections 7 and 8, respectively.

3. THE MAIN TECHNICAL LEMMAS

Important note. The arguments in this paper are very similar to, and draw heavily from, the previous paper [48] of the authors. We recommend therefore that the reader be familiar with that paper first, before reading the current one.

In the proof of the Four Moment Theorem (as well as the Gap Theorem) for $n \times n$ Wigner matrices in [48], a crucial ingredient was a variant of the *Delocalization Theorem* of Erdős, Schlein, and Yau [9, 10, 11]. This result asserts (assuming uniformly exponentially decaying distribution for the coefficients) that with overwhelming probability, all the unit eigenvectors of the Wigner matrix have coefficients $O(n^{-1/2+o(1)})$ (thus the “ ℓ^2 energy” of the eigenvector is spread out more or less uniformly amongst the n coefficients). When one just assumes uniformly bounded C_0 moment rather than uniform exponential decay, the bound becomes $O(n^{-1/2+O(1/C_0)})$ instead (where the implied constant in the exponent is uniform in C_0 , of course).

Similarly, to prove the Four Moment and Gap Theorems in this paper, we will need a Delocalization theorem for the *singular vectors* of the matrix M . We define a *right singular vector* u_i (resp. *left singular vector* v_i) with singular value $\sigma_i(M) = \sqrt{n\lambda_i(W)^{1/2}}$ to be an eigenvector of $W = \frac{1}{n}M^*M$ (resp. $\tilde{W} = \frac{1}{n}MM^*$) with eigenvalue λ_i . In the *generic case* when the singular values are simple (i.e. $0 < \sigma_1 < \dots < \sigma_p$), we observe from the singular value decomposition that one can find orthonormal bases $u_1, \dots, u_p \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $v_1, \dots, v_p \in \mathbb{C}^p$ for the corange $\ker(M)^\perp$ of M and of $\mathbb{C}^p$ respectively, such that

$$Mu_i = \sigma_i v_i$$

and

$$M^*v_i = \sigma_i u_i.$$

Furthermore, in the generic case the unit singular vectors u_i, v_i are determined up to multiplication by a complex phase $e^{i\theta}$.

We will establish the following Erdős-Schlein-Yau type delocalization theorem (analogous to [48, Proposition 62]), which is an essential ingredient to Theorems 16, 15 and is also of some independent interest:

Theorem 18 (Delocalization theorem). *Suppose that $p/n \rightarrow y$ for some $0 < y \leq 1$, and let M obey condition **C1** for some $C_0 \geq 2$. Suppose further that that $|\zeta_{ij}| \leq K$ almost surely for some $K > 1$ (which can depend on n) and all i, j , and that the probability distribution of M is continuous. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be independent of n . Then with overwhelming probability, all the unit left and right singular vectors of M with eigenvalue λ_i in the interval $[a+\varepsilon, b-\varepsilon]$ (with a, b defined in (2)) have all coefficients uniformly of size $O(Kn^{-1/2} \log^{10} n)$.*

The factors $K \log^{10} n$ can probably be improved slightly, but anything which is polynomial in K and $\log n$ will suffice for our purposes. Observe that if M obeys condition **C1**, then each event $|\zeta_{ij}| \leq K$ with $K := n^{10/C_0}$ (say) occurs with probability $1 - O(n^{-10})$. Thus in practice, we will be able to apply the above theorem with $K = n^{10/C_0}$ without difficulty. The continuity hypothesis is a technical one, imposed so that the singular values are almost surely simple, but in practice we will be able to eliminate this hypothesis by a limiting argument (as none of the bounds will depend on any quantitative measure of this continuity).

As with other proofs of delocalization theorems in the literature, Theorem 18 is in turn deduced from the following eigenvalue concentration bound (analogous to [48, Proposition 60]):

Theorem 19 (Eigenvalue concentration theorem). *Let the hypotheses be as in Theorem 18, and let $\delta > 0$ be independent of n . Then for any interval $I \subset [a+\varepsilon, b-\varepsilon]$ of length $|I| \geq K^2 \log^{20} n/n$, one has with overwhelming probability (uniformly in I) that*

$$|N_I - p \int_I \rho_{MP,y}(x) dx| \leq \delta p,$$

where

$$(14) \quad N_I := \{1 \leq i \leq p : \lambda_i(W) \in I\}$$

is the number of eigenvalues in I .

We remark that a very similar result (with slightly different hypotheses on the parameters and on the underlying random variable distributions) was recently established in [14, Corollary 7.2].

We isolate one particular consequence of Theorem 19 (also established in [25]):

Corollary 20 (Concentration of the bulk). *Let the hypotheses be as in Theorem 18. Then there exists $\varepsilon' > 0$ independent of n such that with overwhelming probability, one has $a + \varepsilon' \leq \lambda_i(W) \leq b - \varepsilon'$ for all $\varepsilon p \leq i \leq (1 - \varepsilon)p$.*

Proof. From Theorem 19, we see with overwhelming probability that the number of eigenvalues in $[a + \varepsilon', b - \varepsilon']$ is at least $(1 - \varepsilon)p$, if ε' is sufficiently small depending on ε . The claim follows. $\square$

3.1. Notation. Throughout this paper, n will be an asymptotic parameter going to infinity. Some quantities (e.g. ε , y and C_0) will remain other independent of n , while other quantities (e.g. p , or the matrix M) will depend on n . All statements here are understood to hold only in the asymptotic regime when n is sufficiently large depending on all quantities that are independent of n . We write $X = O(Y)$, $Y = \Omega(|X|)$, $|X| \ll Y$, or $Y \gg |X|$ if one has $|X| \leq CY$ for all sufficiently large n and some C independent of n . (Note however that C is allowed to depend on other quantities independent of n , such as ε and y , unless otherwise stated.) We write $X = o(Y)$ if $|X| \leq c(n)Y$ where $c(n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We write $X = \Theta(Y)$ or $X \preceq Y$ if $X \ll Y \ll X$, thus for instance if $p/n \rightarrow y$ for some $0 < y \leq 1$ then $p = \Theta(n)$.

We write $\sqrt{-1}$ for the complex imaginary unit, in order to free up the letter i to denote an integer (usually between 1 and n).

We write $\|X\|$ for the length of a vector X , $\|A\| = \|A\|_{op}$ for the operator norm of a matrix A , and $\|A\|_F = \text{tr}(AA^*)^{1/2}$ for the Frobenius (or Hilbert-Schmidt) norm.

4. BASIC TOOLS

4.1. Tools from linear algebra. In this section we recall some basic identities and inequalities from linear algebra which will be used in this paper.

We begin with the Cauchy interlacing law and the Weyl inequalities:

Lemma 21 (Cauchy interlacing law). *Let $1 \leq p \leq n$.*

- (i) *If A_n is an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix, and A_{n-1} is an $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ minor, then $\lambda_i(A_n) \leq \lambda_i(A_{n-1}) \leq \lambda_{i+1}(A_n)$ for all $1 \leq i < n$.*
- (ii) *If $M_{n,p}$ is a $p \times n$ matrix, and $M_{n,p-1}$ is an $(p-1) \times n$ minor, then $\sigma_i(M_{n,p}) \leq \sigma_i(M_{n,p-1}) \leq \sigma_{i+1}(M_{n,p})$ for all $1 \leq i < p$.*
- (iii) *If $p < n$, if $M_{n,p}$ is a $p \times n$ matrix, and $M_{n-1,p}$ is a $p \times (n-1)$ minor, then $\sigma_{i-1}(M_{n,p}) \leq \sigma_i(M_{n-1,p}) \leq \sigma_i(M_{n,p})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p$, with the understanding that $\sigma_0(M_{n,p}) = 0$. (For $p = n$, one can of course use the transpose of (ii) instead.)*

Proof. Claim (i) follows from the minimax formula

$$\lambda_i(A_n) = \inf_{V: \dim(V)=i} \sup_{v \in V: \|v\|=1} v^* A_n v$$

where V ranges over i -dimensional subspaces in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Similarly, (ii) and (iii) follow from the minimax formula

$$\sigma_i(M_{n,p}) = \inf_{V: \dim(V)=i+n-p} \sup_{v \in V: \|v\|=1} \|M_{n,p}v\|.$$

□

Lemma 22 (Weyl inequality). *Let $1 \leq p \leq n$.*

- *If A, B are $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices, then $|\lambda_i(A) - \lambda_i(B)| \leq \|A - B\|_{op}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.*
- *If M, N are $p \times n$ matrices, then $|\sigma_i(M) - \sigma_i(N)| \leq \|M - N\|_{op}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p$.*

Proof. This follows from the same minimax formulae used to establish Lemma 21. □

Remark 23. One can also deduce the singular value versions of Lemmas 21, 22 from their Hermitian counterparts by using the augmented matrices (9). We omit the details.

We have the following elementary formula for a component of an eigenvector of a Hermitian matrix, in terms of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of a minor:

Lemma 24 (Formula for coordinate of an eigenvector). [9] *Let*

$$A_n = \begin{pmatrix} A_{n-1} & X \\ X^* & a \end{pmatrix}$$

be a $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $X \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$, and let $\begin{pmatrix} v \\ x \end{pmatrix}$ be a unit eigenvector of A_n with eigenvalue $\lambda_i(A_n)$, where $x \in \mathbb{C}$ and $v \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$. Suppose that none of the eigenvalues of A_{n-1} are equal to $\lambda_i(A_n)$. Then

$$|x|^2 = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (\lambda_j(A_{n-1}) - \lambda_i(A_n))^{-2} |u_j(A_{n-1})^* X|^2},$$

where $u_1(A_{n-1}), \dots, u_{n-1}(A_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ is an orthonormal eigenbasis corresponding to the eigenvalues $\lambda_1(A_{n-1}), \dots, \lambda_{n-1}(A_{n-1})$ of A_{n-1} .

Proof. See e.g. [48, Lemma 41]. □

This implies an analogous formula for singular vectors:

Corollary 25 (Formula for coordinate of a singular vector). *Let $p, n \geq 1$, and let*

$$M_{p,n} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{p,n-1} & X \end{pmatrix}$$

be a $p \times n$ matrix for some $X \in \mathbb{C}^p$, and let $\begin{pmatrix} u \\ x \end{pmatrix}$ be a right unit singular vector of $M_{p,n}$ with singular value $\sigma_i(M_{p,n})$, where $x \in \mathbb{C}$ and $u \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$. Suppose that none

of the singular values of $M_{p,n-1}$ are equal to $\sigma_i(M_{p,n})$. Then

$$|x|^2 = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\min(p,n-1)} \frac{\sigma_j(M_{p,n-1})^2}{(\sigma_j(M_{p,n-1})^2 - \sigma_i(M_{p,n})^2)^2} |v_j(M_{p,n-1})^* X|^2},$$

where $v_1(M_{p,n-1}), \dots, v_{\min(p,n-1)}(M_{p,n-1}) \in \mathbb{C}^p$ is an orthonormal system of left singular vectors corresponding to the non-trivial singular values of $M_{p,n-1}$.

In a similar vein, if

$$M_{p,n} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{p-1,n} \\ Y^* \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $Y \in \mathbb{C}^n$, and $\begin{pmatrix} v & y \end{pmatrix}$ is a left unit singular vector of $M_{p,n}$ with singular value $\sigma_i(M_{p,n})$, where $y \in \mathbb{C}$ and $v \in \mathbb{C}^{p-1}$, and none of the singular values of $M_{p-1,n}$ are equal to $\sigma_i(M_{p,n})$, then

$$|y|^2 = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\min(p-1,n)} \frac{\sigma_j(M_{p-1,n})^2}{(\sigma_j(M_{p-1,n})^2 - \sigma_i(M_{p,n})^2)^2} |u_j(M_{p-1,n})^* Y|^2},$$

where $u_1(M_{p-1,n}), \dots, u_{\min(p-1,n)}(M_{p-1,n}) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is an orthonormal system of right singular vectors corresponding to the non-trivial singular values of $M_{p-1,n}$.

Proof. We just prove the first claim, as the second is proven analogously (or by taking adjoints). Observe that $\begin{pmatrix} u \\ x \end{pmatrix}$ is a unit eigenvector of the matrix

$$M_{p,n}^* M_{p,n} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{p,n-1}^* M_{p,n-1} & M_{p,n-1}^* X \\ X^* M_{p,n-1} & |X|^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

with eigenvalue $\sigma_i(M_{p,n})^2$. Applying Lemma 24, we obtain

$$|x|^2 = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (\lambda_j(M_{p,n-1}^* M_{p,n-1}) - \sigma_i(M_{p,n})^2)^{-2} |u_j(M_{p,n-1}^* M_{p,n-1})^* M_{p,n-1}^* X|^2}.$$

But $u_j(M_{p,n-1}^* M_{p,n-1})^* M_{p,n-1}^* = \sigma_j(M_{p,n-1}) v_j(M_{p,n-1})^*$ for the $\min(p, n-1)$ non-trivial singular values (possibly after relabeling the j), and vanishes for trivial ones, and $\lambda_j(M_{p,n-1}^* M_{p,n-1}) = \sigma_j(M_{p,n-1})^2$, so the claim follows. $\square$

The *Stieltjes transform* $s(z)$ of a Hermitian matrix W is defined for complex z by the formula

$$s(z) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\lambda_i(W) - z}.$$

It has the following alternate representation (see e.g. [2, Chapter 11]):

Lemma 26. *Let $W = (\zeta_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ be a Hermitian matrix, and let z be a complex number not in the spectrum of W . Then we have*

$$s_n(z) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\zeta_{kk} - z - a_k^* (W_k - zI)^{-1} a_k}$$

where W_k is the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrix with the k^{th} row and column removed, and $a_k \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ is the k^{th} column of W with the k^{th} entry removed.

Proof. By Schur's complement, $\frac{1}{\zeta_{kk} - z - a_k^*(W_k - zI)^{-1}a_k}$ is the k^{th} diagonal entry of $(W - zI)^{-1}$. Taking traces, one obtains the claim. $\square$

4.2. Tools from probability theory. We will rely frequently on the following concentration of measure result for projections of random vectors:

Lemma 27 (Distance between a random vector and a subspace). *Let $X = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be a random vector whose entries are independent with mean zero, variance 1, and are bounded in magnitude by K almost surely for some K , where $K \geq 10(\mathbf{E}|\xi|^4 + 1)$. Let H be a subspace of dimension d and π_H the orthogonal projection onto H . Then*

$$\mathbf{P}(|\|\pi_H(X)\| - \sqrt{d}| \geq t) \leq 10 \exp(-\frac{t^2}{10K^2}).$$

In particular, one has

$$\|\pi_H(X)\| = \sqrt{d} + O(K \log n)$$

with overwhelming probability.

Proof. See [48, Lemma 43]; the proof is a short application of Talagrand's inequality [30]. $\square$

5. DELOCALIZATION

The purpose of this section is to establish Theorem 18 and Theorem 19. The material here is closely analogous to [48, Sections 5.2, 5.3], as well as that of the original results in [9, 10, 11] and can be read independently of the other sections of the paper. The recent paper [14] also contains arguments and results closely related to those in this section.

5.1. Deduction of Theorem 18 from Theorem 19. We begin by showing how Theorem 18 follows from Theorem 19. We shall just establish the claim for the right singular vectors u_i , as the claim for the left singular vectors is similar. We fix ε and allow all implied constants to depend on ε and y . We can also assume that $K^2 \log^{20} n = o(n)$ as the claim is trivial otherwise.

As M is continuous, we see that the non-trivial singular values are almost surely simple and positive, so that the singular vectors u_i are well defined up to unit phases. Fix $1 \leq i \leq p$; it suffices by the union bound and symmetry to show that the event that λ_i falls outside $[a + \varepsilon, b - \varepsilon]$ or that the n^{th} coordinate x of u_i is $O(Kn^{-1/2} \log^{10} n)$ holds with (uniformly) overwhelming probability.

Applying Corollary 25, it suffices to show that with uniformly overwhelming probability, either $\lambda_i \notin [a + \varepsilon, b - \varepsilon]$, or

$$(15) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\min(p, n-1)} \frac{\sigma_j(M_{p, n-1})^2}{(\sigma_j(M_{p, n-1})^2 - \sigma_i(M_{p, n})^2)^2} |v_j(M_{p, n-1})^* X|^2 \gg \frac{n}{K^2 \log^{20} n},$$

where $M = (M_{p,n-1} \ X)$. But if $\lambda_i \in [a + \varepsilon, b - \varepsilon]$, then by⁴ Theorem 19, one can find (with uniformly overwhelming probability) a set $J \subset \{1, \dots, \min(p, n-1)\}$ with $|J| \gg K^2 \log^{20} n$ such that $\lambda_j(M_{p,n-1}) = \lambda_i(M_{p,n}) + O(K^2 \log^{20} n/n)$ for all $j \in J$; since $\lambda_i = \frac{1}{n} \sigma_i^2$, we conclude that $\sigma_j(M_{p,n-1})^2 = \sigma_i(M_{p,n})^2 + O(K^2 \log^{20} n)$. In particular, $\sigma_j(M_{p,n-1}) = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$. By Pythagoras' theorem, the left-hand side of (15) is then bounded from below by

$$\gg n \frac{\|\pi_H X\|^2}{(K^2 \log^{20} n)^2}$$

where $H \subset \mathbb{C}^p$ is the span of the $v_j(M_{p,n-1})$ for $j \in J$. But from Lemma 27 (and the fact that X is independent of $M_{p,n-1}$), one has

$$\|\pi_H X\|^2 \gg K^2 \log^{20} n$$

with uniformly overwhelming probability, and the claim follows.

It thus remains to establish Theorem 19.

5.2. A crude upper bound. Let the hypotheses be as in Theorem 19. We first establish a crude upper bound, which illustrates the techniques used to prove Theorem 19, and also plays an important direct role in that proof:

Proposition 28 (Eigenvalue upper bound). *Let the hypotheses be as in Theorem 18. then for any interval $I \subset [a + \varepsilon, b - \varepsilon]$ of length $|I| \geq K \log^2 n/n$, one has with overwhelming probability (uniformly in I) that*

$$|N_I| \ll n|I|$$

where $|I|$ denotes the length of I , and N_I was defined in (14).

To prove this proposition, we suppose for contradiction that

$$(16) \quad |N_I| \geq Cn|I|$$

for some large constant C to be chosen later. We will show that for C large enough, this leads to a contradiction with overwhelming probability.

We follow the standard approach (see e.g. [2]) of controlling the eigenvalue counting function N_I via the Stieltjes transform

$$s(z) := \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{\lambda_j(W) - z}.$$

Fix I . If x is the midpoint of I , $\eta := |I|/2$, and $z := x + \sqrt{-1}\eta$, we see that

$$\operatorname{Im} s(z) \gg \frac{|N_I|}{\eta p}$$

(recall that $p = \Theta(n)$) so from (16) one has

$$(17) \quad \operatorname{Im}(s(z)) \gg C.$$

⁴In the case $p = n$, one would have to replace $M_{p,n-1}$ by its transpose to return to the regime $p \leq n$.

Applying Lemma 26, with W replaced by the $p \times p$ matrix $\tilde{W} := \frac{1}{n}MM^*$ (which only has the non-trivial eigenvalues), we see that

$$(18) \quad s(z) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{1}{\xi_{kk} - z - a_k^*(W_k - zI)^{-1}a_k},$$

where ξ_{kk} is the kk entry of W' , W_k is the $(p-1) \times (p-1)$ matrix with the k^{th} row and column of $\tilde{W}$ removed, and $a_k \in \mathbb{C}^{p-1}$ is the k^{th} column of $\tilde{W}$ with the k^{th} entry removed.

Using the crude bound $|\operatorname{Im} \frac{1}{z}| \leq \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Im}(z)|}$ and (17), one concludes

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{1}{|\eta + \operatorname{Im} a_k^*(W_k - zI)^{-1}a_k|} \gg C.$$

By the pigeonhole principle, there exists $1 \leq k \leq p$ such that

$$(19) \quad \frac{1}{|\eta + \operatorname{Im} a_k^*(W_k - zI)^{-1}a_k|} \gg C.$$

The fact that k varies will cost us a factor of p in our probability estimates, but this will not be of concern since all of our claims will hold with overwhelming probability.

Fix k . Note that

$$(20) \quad a_k = \frac{1}{n} M_k X_k$$

and

$$W_k = \frac{1}{n} M_k M_k^*$$

where $X_k \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is the (adjoint of the) k^{th} row of M , and M_k is the $(p-1) \times n$ matrix formed by removing that row. Thus, if we let $v_1(M_k), \dots, v_{p-1}(M_k) \in \mathbb{C}^{p-1}$ and $u_1(M_k), \dots, u_{p-1}(M_k) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be coupled orthonormal systems of left and right singular vectors of M_k , and let $\lambda_j(W_k) = \frac{1}{n} \sigma_j(M_k)^2$ for $1 \leq j \leq p-1$ be the associated eigenvalues, one has

$$(21) \quad a_k^*(W_k - zI)^{-1}a_k = \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{|a_k^* v_j(M_k)|^2}{\lambda_j(W_k) - z}.$$

and thus

$$\operatorname{Im} a_k^*(W_k - zI)^{-1}a_k \geq \eta \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{|a_k^* v_j(M_k)|^2}{\eta^2 + |\lambda_j(W_k) - x|^2}.$$

We conclude that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{|a_k^* v_j(M_k)|^2}{\eta^2 + |\lambda_j(W_k) - x|^2} \ll \frac{1}{C\eta}.$$

The expression $a_k^* v_j(M_k)$ can be rewritten much more favorably using (20) as

$$(22) \quad a_k^* v_j(M_k) = \frac{\sigma_j(M_k)}{n} X_k^* u_j(M_k).$$

The advantage of this latter formulation is that the random variables X_k and $u_j(M_k)$ are independent (for fixed k).

Next, note that from (16) and the Cauchy interlacing law (Lemma 21) one can find an interval $J \subset \{1, \dots, p-1\}$ of length

$$(23) \quad |J| \gg C\eta n$$

such that $\lambda_j(W_k) \in I$. We conclude that

$$\sum_{j \in J} \frac{\sigma_j(M_k)^2}{n^2} |X_k^* u_j(M_k)|^2 \ll \frac{\eta}{C}.$$

Since $\lambda_j(W_k) \in I$, one has $\sigma_j(M_k) = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$, and thus

$$\sum_{j \in J} |X_k^* u_j(M_k)|^2 \ll \frac{\eta n}{C}.$$

The left-hand side can be rewritten using Pythagoras' theorem as $\|\pi_H X_k\|^2$, where H is the span of the eigenvectors $u_j(M_k)$ for $j \in J$. But from Lemma 27 and (23) we see that this quantity is $\gg \eta n$ with overwhelming probability, giving the desired contradiction with overwhelming property (even after taking the union bound in k). This concludes the proof of Proposition 28.

5.3. Reduction to a Stieltjes transform bound. We now begin the proof of Theorem 19 in earnest. We continue to allow all implied constants to depend on ε and y .

It suffices by a limiting argument (using Lemma 22) to establish the claim under the assumption that the distribution of M is continuous; our arguments will not use any quantitative estimates on this continuity.

The strategy is to compare s with the Marchenko-Pastur Stieltjes transform

$$s_{MP,y}(z) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_{MP,y}(x) \frac{1}{x-z} dx.$$

A routine application of (1) and the Cauchy integral formula yields the explicit formula

$$(24) \quad s_{MP,y}(z) = -\frac{y+z-1 - \sqrt{(y+z-1)^2 - 4yz}}{2yz}$$

where we use the branch of $\sqrt{(y+z-1)^2 - 4yz}$ with cut at $[a, b]$ that is asymptotic to $y-z+1$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$. To put it another way, for z in the upper half-plane, $s_{MP,y}(z)$ is the unique solution to the equation

$$(25) \quad s_{MP,y} = -\frac{1}{y+z-1 + yzs_{MP,y}(z)}$$

with $\text{Im} s_{MP,y}(z) > 0$. (Details of these computations can also be found in [2].)

We have the following standard relation between convergence of Stieltjes transform and convergence of the counting function:

Lemma 29 (Control of Stieltjes transform implies control on ESD). *Let $1/10 \geq \eta \geq 1/n$, and $L, \varepsilon, \delta > 0$. Suppose that one has the bound*

$$(26) \quad |s_{MP,y}(z) - s(z)| \leq \delta$$

with (uniformly) overwhelming probability for each z with $|\operatorname{Re}(z)| \leq L$ and $\operatorname{Im}(z) \geq \eta$. Then for any interval I in $[a + \varepsilon, b - \varepsilon]$ with $|I| \geq \max(2\eta, \frac{\eta}{\delta} \log \frac{1}{\delta})$, one has

$$|N_I - n \int_I \rho_{MP,y}(x) dx| \ll \delta n |I|$$

with overwhelming probability.

Proof. This follows from [48, Lemma 64]; strictly speaking, that lemma was phrased for the semi-circular distribution rather than the Marchenko-Pastur distribution, but an inspection of the proof shows the proof can be modified without difficulty. See also [23] and [9, Corollary 4.2] for closely related lemmas. $\square$

In view of this lemma, we see that to show Theorem 19, it suffices to show that for each complex number z with $a + \varepsilon/2 \leq \operatorname{Re}(z) \leq b - \varepsilon/2$ and $\operatorname{Im}(z) \geq \eta := \frac{K^2 \log^{19} n}{n}$, one has

$$(27) \quad s(z) - s_{MP,y}(z) = o(1)$$

with (uniformly) overwhelming probability.

For this, we return to the formula (18); inserting the identities (21), (22) one has

$$(28) \quad s(z) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{1}{\xi_{kk} - z - Y_k}$$

where

$$Y_k := \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{\lambda_j(M_k)}{n} \frac{|X_k^* u_j(M_k)|^2}{\lambda_j(W_k) - z}.$$

Suppose we condition M_k (and thus W_k) to be fixed; the entries of X_k remain independent with mean zero and variance 1, and thus (since the u_j are unit vectors)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(Y_k | M_k) &= \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{\lambda_j(M_k)}{n} \frac{1}{\lambda_j(W_k) - z} \\ &= \frac{p-1}{n} (1 + z s_k(z)) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$s_k(z) := \frac{1}{p-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{1}{\lambda_j(W_k) - z}$$

is the Stieltjes transform of W_k .

From the Cauchy interlacing law (Lemma 21) we see that the difference

$$s(z) - \frac{p-1}{p} s_k(z) = \frac{1}{p} \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{\lambda_j(W) - z} - \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{1}{\lambda_j(W_k) - z} \right)$$

is bounded in magnitude by $O(\frac{1}{p})$ times the total variation of the function $\lambda \mapsto \frac{1}{\lambda - z}$ on $[0, +\infty)$, which is $O(\frac{1}{\eta})$. Thus

$$\frac{p-1}{p}s_k(z) = s(z) + O(\frac{1}{p\eta})$$

and thus

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(Y_k|M_k) &= \frac{p-1}{n} + \frac{p}{n}zs(z) + O(\frac{1}{n\eta}) \\ &= y + o(1) + (y + o(1))zs(z) \end{aligned}$$

since $p/n = y + o(1)$ and $1/\eta = o(n)$.

We will shortly show a similar bound for Y_k itself:

Lemma 30 (Concentration of Y_k). *For each $1 \leq k \leq p$, one has $Y_k = y + o(1) + (y + o(1))zs(z)$ with overwhelming probability (uniformly in k and I).*

Meanwhile, we have

$$\xi_{kk} = \frac{1}{n}\|X_k\|^2$$

and hence by Lemma 27, $\xi_{kk} = 1 + o(1)$ with overwhelming probability (again uniformly in k and I). Inserting these bounds into (28), one obtains

$$s(z) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{1}{1 - z - (y + o(1)) - (y + o(1))zs(z)}$$

with overwhelming probability; thus $s(z)$ “almost solves” (25) in some sense. From the quadratic formula, the two solutions of (25) are $s_{MP,y}(z)$ and $-\frac{y+z-1}{yz} - s_{MP,y}(z)$. One concludes that with overwhelming probability, one has either

$$(30) \quad s(z) = s_{MP,y}(z) + o(1)$$

or

$$(31) \quad s(z) = -\frac{y+z-1}{yz} + o(1)$$

or

$$(32) \quad s(z) = -\frac{y+z-1}{yz} - s_{MP,y}(z) + o(1)$$

(with the convention that $\frac{y+z-1}{yz} = 1$ when $y = 1$). By using a n^{-100} -net (say) of possible z 's and using the union bound (and the fact that $s(z)$ has a Lipschitz constant of at most $O(n^{10})$ (say) in the region of interest) we may assume that the above trichotomy holds for all z with $a + \varepsilon/2 \leq \operatorname{Re}(z) \leq b - \varepsilon/2$ and $\eta \leq \operatorname{Im}(z) \leq n^{10}$ (say).

When $\operatorname{Im}(z) = n^{10}$, then $s(z), s_{MP,y}(z)$ are both $o(1)$, and so (30) holds in this case. By continuity, we thus claim that either (30) holds for all z in the domain of interest, or there exists a z such that (30) as well as one of (31) or (32) both hold.

From (25) one has

$$s_{MP,y}(z) \left(\frac{y+z-1}{yz} + s_{MP,y}(z) \right) = -\frac{1}{yz}$$

which implies that the separation between $s_{MP,y}(z)$ from $-\frac{y+z-1}{yz}$ is bounded from below, which implies that (30), (31) cannot both hold (for n large enough). Similarly, from (24) we see that

$$\frac{y+z-1}{yz} + 2s_{MP,y}(z) = \frac{\sqrt{(y+z-1)^2 - 4yz}}{yz};$$

since $(y+z-1)^2 - 4yz$ has zeroes only when $z = a, b$, and z is bounded away from these singularities, we see also that (30), (32) cannot both hold (for n large enough). Thus the continuity argument shows that (30) holds with uniformly overwhelming probability for all z in the region of interest for n large enough, which gives (27) and thus Theorem 19.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 16 AND THEOREM 17

We first prove Theorem 16. The arguments follow those in [48].

We begin by observing from Markov's inequality and the union bound that one has $|\zeta_{ij}|, |\zeta'_{ij}| \leq n^{10/C_0}$ (say) for all i, j with probability $O(n^{-8})$. Thus, by truncation (and adjusting the moments appropriately, using Lemma 22 to absorb the error), one may assume without loss of generality that

$$(33) \quad |\zeta_{ij}|, |\zeta'_{ij}| \leq n^{10/C_0}$$

almost surely for all i, j . Next, by a further approximation argument we may assume that the distribution of M, M' is continuous. This is a purely qualitative assumption, to ensure that the singular values are almost surely simple; our bounds will not depend on any quantitative measure on the continuity, and so the general case then follows by a limiting argument using Lemma 22.

The key technical step is the following theorem, whose proof is delayed to the next section.

Theorem 31 (Truncated Four Moment Theorem). *For sufficiently small $c_0 > 0$ and sufficiently large $C_0 > 0$ the following holds for every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $k \geq 1$. Let $M = (\zeta_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ and $M' = (\zeta'_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ be matrix ensembles obeying condition **C1** for some C_0 , as well as (33). Assume that $p/n \rightarrow y$ for some $0 < y \leq 1$, and that ζ_{ij} and ζ'_{ij} match to order 4.*

Let $G : \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}_+^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function obeying the derivative bounds

$$(34) \quad |\nabla^j G(x_1, \dots, x_k, q_1, \dots, q_k)| \leq n^{c_0}$$

for all $0 \leq j \leq 5$ and $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}$, $q_1, \dots, q_k \in \mathbb{R}$, and such that G is supported on the region $q_1, \dots, q_k \leq n^{c_0}$, and the gradient ∇ is in all $2k$ variables.

Then for any $\varepsilon p \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq (1-\varepsilon)p$, and for n sufficiently large depending on ε, k, c_0 we have

$$(35) \quad |\mathbf{E}(G(\sqrt{n}\sigma_{i_1}(M), \dots, \sqrt{n}\sigma_{i_k}(M), Q_{i_1}(M), \dots, Q_{i_k}(M))) - \mathbf{E}(G(\sqrt{n}\sigma_{i_1}(M'), \dots, \sqrt{n}\sigma_{i_k}(M'), Q_{i_1}(M'), \dots, Q_{i_k}(M')))| \leq n^{-c_0}.$$

If ζ_{ij}, ζ'_{ij} match to order 3, then the conclusion still holds as long as one strengthens (34) to

$$(36) \quad |\nabla^j G(x_1, \dots, x_k, q_1, \dots, q_k)| \leq n^{-jc_1}$$

for some $c_1 > 0$, if c_0 is sufficiently small depending on c_1 .

Given a $p \times n$ matrix M we form the augmented matrix $\mathbf{M}$ defined in (9), whose eigenvalues are $\pm\sigma_1(M), \dots, \pm\sigma_p(M)$, together with the eigenvalue 0 with multiplicity $n - p$ (if $p < n$). For each $1 \leq i \leq p$, we introduce (in analogy with the arguments in [48]) the quantities

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i(\mathbf{M}) &:= \sum_{\lambda \neq \sigma_i(M)} \frac{1}{|\sqrt{n}(\lambda - \sigma_i(M))|^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq p: j \neq i} \frac{1}{|\sigma_j(M) - \sigma_i(M)|^2} + \frac{n-p}{\sigma_i(M)^2} + \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{|\sigma_j(M) + \sigma_i(M)|^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

(The factor of $\frac{1}{n}$ in $Q_i(\mathbf{M})$ is present to align the notation here with that in [48], in which one dilated the matrix by $\sqrt{n}$.) We set $Q_i(\mathbf{M}) = \infty$ if the singular value σ_i is repeated, but this event occurs with probability zero since we are assuming M to be continuously distributed.

The gap property on M ensures an upper bound on $Q_i(\mathbf{M})$:

Lemma 32. *If M satisfies the gap property, then for any $c_0 > 0$ (independent of n), and any $\varepsilon p \leq i \leq (1 - \varepsilon)p$, one has $Q_i(\mathbf{M}) \leq n^{c_0}$ with high probability.*

Proof. Observe the upper bound

$$(37) \quad Q_i(\mathbf{M}) \leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq p: j \neq i} \frac{1}{|\sigma_j(M) - \sigma_i(M)|^2} + \frac{n-p+1}{n\sigma_i(M)^2}.$$

From Corollary 20 we see that with overwhelming probability, $\sigma_i(M)^2/n$ is bounded away from zero, and so $\frac{n-p+1}{n\sigma_i(M)^2} = O(1/n)$. To bound the other term in (37), one repeats the proof of [48, Lemma 49]. $\square$

By applying a truncation argument exactly as in [48, Section 3.3], one can now remove the hypothesis in Theorem 31 that G is supported in the region $q_1, \dots, q_k \leq n^{c_0}$. In particular, one can now handle the case when G is independent of $q_1, \dots, q_k$; and Theorem 16 follows after making the change of variables $\lambda = \frac{1}{n}\sigma^2$ and using the chain rule (and Corollary 20).

Next, we prove Theorem 17, assuming both Theorems 31 and 15. The main observation here is the following lemma.

Lemma 33 (Matching lemma). *Let ζ be a complex random variable with mean zero, unit variance, and third moment bounded by some constant a . Then there exists a complex random variable $\tilde{\zeta}$ with support bounded by the ball of radius $O_a(1)$*

centered at the origin (and in particular, obeying the exponential decay hypothesis uniformly in ζ for fixed a) which matches ζ to third order.

Proof. In order for $\tilde{\zeta}$ to match ζ to third order, it suffices that $\tilde{\zeta}$ have mean zero, variance 1, and that $\mathbf{E}\tilde{\zeta}^3 = \mathbf{E}\zeta^3$ and $\mathbf{E}\tilde{\zeta}^2\bar{\tilde{\zeta}} = \mathbf{E}\zeta^3\bar{\zeta}$.

Accordingly, let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be the set of pairs $(\mathbf{E}\tilde{\zeta}^3, \mathbf{E}\tilde{\zeta}^2\bar{\tilde{\zeta}})$ where $\tilde{\zeta}$ ranges over complex random variables with mean zero, variance one, and compact support. Clearly Ω is convex. It is also invariant under the symmetry $(z, w) \mapsto (e^{3i\theta}z, e^{i\theta}w)$ for any phase θ . Thus, if $(z, w) \in \Omega$, then $(-z, e^{i\pi/3}w) \in \Omega$, and hence by convexity $(0, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}e^{i\pi/6}w) \in \Omega$, and hence by convexity and rotation invariance $(0, w') \in \Omega$ whenever $|w'| \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}w$. Since (z, w) and $(0, -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}w)$ both lie in Ω , by convexity $(cz, 0)$ lies in it also for some absolute constant $c > 0$, and so again by convexity and rotation invariance $(z', 0) \in \Omega$ whenever $|z'| \leq cz$. One last application of convexity then gives $(z'/2, w'/2) \in \Omega$ whenever $|z'| \leq cz$ and $|w'| \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}w$.

It is easy to construct complex random variables with mean zero, variance one, compact support, and arbitrarily large third moment. Since the third moment is comparable to $|z| + |w|$, we thus conclude that Ω contains all of $\mathbb{C}^2$, i.e. every complex random variable with finite third moment with mean zero and unit variance can be matched to third order by a variable of compact support. An inspection of the argument shows that if the third moment is bounded by a then the support can also be bounded by $O_a(1)$. $\square$

Now consider a random matrix M as in Theorem 17 with atom variables ζ_{ij} . By the above lemma, for each i, j , we can find ζ'_{ij} which satisfies the exponential decay hypothesis and match ζ_{ij} to third order. Let $\eta(q)$ be a smooth cutoff to the region $q \leq n^{c_0}$ for some $c_0 > 0$ independent of n , and let $\varepsilon p \leq i \leq (1 - \varepsilon)p$. By Theorem 15, the matrix M' formed by the ζ'_{ij} satisfies the gap property. By Lemma 32,

$$\mathbf{E}\eta(Q_i(M')) = 1 - O(n^{-c_1})$$

for some $c_1 > 0$ independent of n , so by Theorem 31 one has

$$\mathbf{E}\eta(Q_i(M)) = 1 - O(n^{-c_2})$$

for some $c_2 > 0$ independent of n . We conclude that M also obeys the gap property.

The next two sections are devoted to the proofs of Theorem 31 and Theorem 15, respectively.

Remark 34. The above trick to remove the exponential decay hypothesis for Theorem 15 also works to remove the same hypothesis in [48, Theorem 19]. The point is that in the analogue of Theorem 31 in that paper (implicit in [48, Section 3.3]), the exponential decay hypothesis is not used anywhere in the argument; only a uniformly bounded C_0 moment for C_0 large enough is required, as is the case here. Because of this, one can replace all the exponential decay hypotheses in the results of [48, 49] by a hypothesis of bounded C_0 moment; we omit the details.

7. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 31

It remains to prove Theorem 31. By telescoping series, it suffices to establish a bound

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{E}(G(\sqrt{n}\sigma_{i_1}(M), \dots, \sqrt{n}\sigma_{i_k}(M), Q_{i_1}(M), \dots, Q_{i_k}(M))) \\ & - \mathbf{E}(G(\sqrt{n}\sigma_{i_1}(M'), \dots, \sqrt{n}\sigma_{i_k}(M'), Q_{i_1}(M'), \dots, Q_{i_k}(M')))| \\ & \leq n^{-2-c_0} \end{aligned}$$

under the assumption that the coefficients ζ_{ij} , ζ'_{ij} of M and M' are identical except in one entry, say the qr entry for some $1 \leq q \leq p$ and $1 \leq r \leq n$, since the claim then follows by interchanging each of the $pn = O(n^2)$ entries of M into M' separately.

Write $M(z)$ for the matrix M (or M') with the qr entry replaced by z . We apply the following proposition, which follows from a lengthy argument in [48]:

Proposition 35 (Replacement given a good configuration). *Let the notation and assumptions be as in Theorem 31. There exists a positive constant C_1 (independent of k) such that the following holds. Let $\varepsilon_1 > 0$. We condition (i.e. freeze) all the entries of $M(z)$ to be constant, except for the qr entry, which is z . We assume that for every $1 \leq j \leq k$ and every $|z| \leq n^{1/2+\varepsilon_1}$ whose real and imaginary parts are multiples of n^{-C_1} , we have*

$$(39) \quad \begin{aligned} & \bullet \text{ (Singular value separation) For any } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ with } |i - i_j| \geq n^{\varepsilon_1}, \text{ we have} \\ & |\sqrt{n}\sigma_i(M(z)) - \sqrt{n}\sigma_{i_j}(M(z))| \geq n^{-\varepsilon_1}|i - i_j|. \end{aligned}$$

Also, we assume

$$(40) \quad \sqrt{n}\sigma_{i_j}(A(z)) \geq n^{-\varepsilon_1}n.$$

- (Delocalization at i_j) If $u_{i_j}(M(z)) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $v_{i_j}(M(z)) \in \mathbb{C}^p$ are unit right and left singular vectors of $M(z)$, then

$$(41) \quad |e_q^* v_{i_j}(M(z))|, |e_r^* u_{i_j}(M(z))| \leq n^{-1/2+\varepsilon_1}.$$

- For every $\alpha \geq 0$

$$(42) \quad \|P_{i_j, \alpha}(M(z))e_q\|, \|P'_{i_j, \alpha}(M(z))e_r\| \leq 2^{\alpha/2}n^{-1/2+\varepsilon_1},$$

whenever $P_{i_j, \alpha}$ (resp. $P'_{i_j, \alpha}$) is the orthogonal projection to the span of right singular vectors $u_i(M(z))$ (resp. left singular vectors $v_i(M(z))$) corresponding to singular values $\sigma_i(A(z))$ with $2^\alpha \leq |i - i_j| < 2^{\alpha+1}$.

We say that $M(0), e_q, e_r$ are a good configuration for $i_1, \dots, i_k$ if the above properties hold. Assuming this good configuration, then we have (38) if ζ_{ij} and ζ'_{ij} match to order 4, or if they match to order 3 and (36) holds.

Proof. This follows by applying [48, Proposition 46] to the $p+n \times p+n$ Hermitian matrix $A(z) := \sqrt{n}\mathbf{M}(z)$, where $\mathbf{M}(z)$ is the augmented matrix of $M(z)$, defined in (9). Note that the eigenvalues of $A(z)$ are $\pm\sqrt{n}\sigma_1(M(z)), \dots, \pm\sqrt{n}\sigma_p(M(z))$ and 0, and that the eigenvalues are given (up to unit phases) by $\begin{pmatrix} v_j(M(z)) \\ \pm u_j(M(z)) \end{pmatrix}$.

Note also that the analogue of (42) in [48, Proposition 46] is trivially true if 2^α is comparable to n , so one can restrict attention to the regime $2^\alpha = o(n)$. $\square$

In view of the above proposition, we see that to conclude the proof of Theorem 31 (and thus Theorem 16) it suffices to show that for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, that $M(0), e_q, e_r$ are a good configuration for $i_1, \dots, i_k$ with overwhelming probability, if C_0 is sufficiently large depending on ε_1 (cf. [48, Proposition 48]).

Our main tools for this are Theorem 18 and Theorem 19. Actually, we need a slight variant:

Proposition 36. *The conclusions of Theorem 18 and Theorem 19 continue to hold if one replaces the qr entry of M by a deterministic number $z = O(n^{1/2+O(1/C_0)})$.*

This is proven exactly as in [48, Corollary 63] and is omitted.

We return to the task of establishing a good configuration with overwhelming probability. By the union bound we may fix $1 \leq j \leq k$, and also fix the $|z| \leq n^{1/2+\varepsilon_1}$ whose real and imaginary parts are multiples of n^{-C_1} . By the union bound again and Proposition 36, the eigenvalue separation condition (39) holds with overwhelming probability for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ with $|i - j| \geq n^{\varepsilon_1}$ (if C_0 is sufficiently large), as does (41). A similar argument using Pythagoras' theorem and Corollary 20 gives (42) with overwhelming probability (noting as before that we may restrict attention to the regime $2^\alpha = o(n)$). Corollary 20 also gives (40) with overwhelming probability. This gives the claim, and Theorem 16 follows.

8. PROOF OF THEOREM 15

We now prove Theorem 15, closely following the analogous arguments in [48]. Using the exponential decay condition, we may truncate the ζ_{ij} (and renormalise moments, using Lemma 22) to assume that

$$(43) \quad |\zeta_{ij}| \leq \log^{O(1)} n$$

almost surely. By a limiting argument we may assume that M has a continuous distribution, so that the singular values are almost surely simple.

We write i_0 instead of i , p_0 instead of p , and write $N_0 := p_0 + n$. As in [48], the strategy is to propagate a narrow gap for $M = M_{p_0, n}$ backwards in the p variable, until one can use Theorem 19 to show that the gap occurs with small probability.

More precisely, for any $1 \leq i - l < i \leq p \leq p_0$, we let $M_{p, n}$ be the $p \times n$ matrix formed using the first p rows of $M_{p_0, n}$, and we define (following [48]) the *regularized gap*

$$(44) \quad g_{i, l, p} := \inf_{1 \leq i_- \leq i-l < i \leq i_+ \leq p} \frac{\sqrt{N_0} \sigma_{i_+}(M_{p, n}) - \sqrt{N_0} \sigma_{i_-}(M_{p, n})}{\min(i_+ - i_-, \log^{C_1} N_0)^{\log^{0.9} N_0}},$$

where $C_1 > 1$ is a large constant to be chosen later. It will suffice to show that

$$(45) \quad g_{i_0,1,p_0} \leq n^{-c_0}.$$

The main tool for this is

Lemma 37 (Backwards propagation of gap). *Suppose that $p_0/2 \leq p < p_0$ and $l \leq \varepsilon p/10$ is such that*

$$(46) \quad g_{i_0,l,p+1} \leq \delta$$

for some $0 < \delta \leq 1$ (which can depend on n), and that

$$(47) \quad g_{i_0,l+1,p} \geq 2^m g_{i_0,l,p+1}$$

for some $m \geq 0$ with

$$(48) \quad 2^m \leq \delta^{-1/2}.$$

Let X_{p+1} be the $p+1^{\text{th}}$ row of $M_{p_0,n}$, and let $u_1(M_{p,n}), \dots, u_p(M_{p,n})$ be an orthonormal system of right singular vectors of $M_{p,n}$ associated to $\sigma_1(M_{p,n}), \dots, \sigma_p(M_{p,n})$. Then one of the following statements hold:

- (i) (Macroscopic spectral concentration) *There exists $1 \leq i_- < i_+ \leq p+1$ with $i_+ - i_- \geq \log^{C_1/2} n$ such that $|\sqrt{n}\sigma_{i_+}(M_{p+1,n}) - \sqrt{n}\sigma_{i_-}(M_{p+1,n})| \leq \delta^{1/4} \exp(\log^{0.95} n)(i_+ - i_-)$.*
- (ii) (Small inner products) *There exists $\varepsilon p/2 \leq i_- \leq i_0 - l < i_0 \leq i_+ \leq (1 - \varepsilon/2)p$ with $i_+ - i_- \leq \log^{C_1/2} n$ such that*

$$(49) \quad \sum_{i_- \leq j < i_+} |X_{p+1}^* u_j(M_{p,n})|^2 \leq \frac{i_+ - i_-}{2^{m/2} \log^{0.01} n}.$$

- (iii) (Large singular value) *For some $1 \leq i \leq p+1$ one has*

$$|\sigma_i(M_{p+1,n})| \geq \frac{\sqrt{n} \exp(-\log^{0.95} n)}{\delta^{1/2}}.$$

- (iv) (Large inner product in bulk) *There exists $\varepsilon p/10 \leq i \leq (1 - \varepsilon/10)p$ such that*

$$|X_{p+1}^* u_i(M_{p,n})|^2 \geq \frac{\exp(-\log^{0.96} n)}{\delta^{1/2}}.$$

- (v) (Large row) *We have*

$$\|X_{p+1}\|^2 \geq \frac{n \exp(-\log^{0.96} n)}{\delta^{1/2}}.$$

- (vi) (Large inner product near i_0) *There exists $\varepsilon p/10 \leq i \leq (1 - \varepsilon/10)p$ with $|i - i_0| \leq \log^{C_1} n$ such that*

$$|X_{p+1}^* u_i(M_{p,n})|^2 \geq 2^{m/2} n \log^{0.8} n.$$

Proof. This follows by applying⁵ [48, Lemma 51] to the $p + n + 1 \times p + n + 1$ Hermitian matrix

$$A_{p+n+1} := \sqrt{n} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_{p+1,n}^* \\ M_{p+1,n} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which after removing the bottom row and rightmost column (which is X_{p+1} , plus $p + 1$ zeroes) yields the $p + n \times p + n$ Hermitian matrix

$$A_{p+n} := \sqrt{n} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_{p,n}^* \\ M_{p,n} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

which has eigenvalues $\pm\sqrt{n}\sigma_1(M_{p,n}), \dots, \pm\sqrt{n}\sigma_p(M_{p,n})$ and 0, and an orthonormal eigenbasis that includes the vectors $\begin{pmatrix} u_j(M_{p,n}) \\ v_j(M_{p,n}) \end{pmatrix}$ for $1 \leq j \leq p$. (The “large coefficient” event in [48, Lemma 51(iii)] cannot occur here, as A_{p+n+1} has zero diagonal.) $\square$

By repeating the arguments in [48, Section 3.5] almost verbatim, it then suffices to show that

Proposition 38 (Bad events are rare). *Suppose that $p_0/2 \leq p < p_0$ and $l \leq \varepsilon p/10$, and set $\delta := n_0^{-\kappa}$ for some sufficiently small fixed $\kappa > 0$. Then:*

- (a) *The events (i), (iii), (iv), (v) in Lemma 37 all fail with high probability.*
- (b) *There is a constant C' such that all the coefficients of the right singular vectors $u_j(M_{p,n})$ for $\varepsilon p/2 \leq j \leq (1 - \varepsilon/2)p$ are of magnitude at most $n^{-1/2} \log^{C'} n$ with overwhelming probability. Conditioning $M_{p,n}$ to be a matrix with this property, the events (ii) and (vi) occur with a conditional probability of at most $2^{-\kappa m} + n^{-\kappa}$.*
- (c) *Furthermore, there is a constant C_2 (depending on C', κ, C_1) such that if $l \geq C_2$ and $M_{p,n}$ is conditioned as in (b), then (ii) and (vi) in fact occur with a conditional probability of at most $2^{-\kappa m} \log^{-2C_1} n + n^{-\kappa}$.*

But Proposition 38 can be proven by repeating the proof of [48, Proposition 53] with only cosmetic changes, the only significant difference being that Theorem 19 and Theorem 18 are applied instead of [48, Theorem 60] and [48, Proposition 62] respectively.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Anderson, A. Guionnet and O. Zeitouni, An introduction to random matrices, *book to be published by Cambridge Univ. Press*.
- [2] Z. D. Bai and J. Silverstein, Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices, Mathematics Monograph Series **2**, Science Press, Beijing 2006.
- [3] G. Ben Arous and S. Péché, Universality of local eigenvalue statistics for some sample covariance matrices, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 58 (2005), no. 10, 1316–1357.

⁵Strictly speaking, there are some harmless adjustments by constant factors that need to be made to this lemma, ultimately coming from the fact that $n, p, n + p$ are only comparable up to constants, rather than equal, but these adjustments make only a negligible change to the proof of that lemma.

- [4] K. Costello and V. Vu, Concentration of random determinants and permanent estimators, *to appear in SIAM discrete math.*
- [5] P. Deift, Orthogonal polynomials and random matrices: a Riemann-Hilbert approach. Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 3. New York University, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
- [6] P. Deift, Universality for mathematical and physical systems. *International Congress of Mathematicians* Vol. I, 125–152, Eur. Math. Soc., Zrich, 2007.
- [7] A. Edelman, Eigenvalues and condition numbers of random matrices, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* **9** (1988), 543–560.
- [8] A. Edelman, The distribution and moments of the smallest eigenvalue of a random matrix of Wishart type, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **159** (1991), 55–80.
- [9] L. Erdős, B. Schlein and H-T. Yau, Semicircle law on short scales and delocalization of eigenvectors for Wigner random matrices, *to appear in Annals of Probability.*
- [10] L. Erdős, B. Schlein and H-T. Yau, Local semicircle law and complete delocalization for Wigner random matrices, *to appear in Comm. Math. Phys.*
- [11] L. Erdős, B. Schlein and H-T. Yau, Wegner estimate and level repulsion for Wigner random matrices, *submitted.*
- [12] L. Erdős, J. Ramirez, B. Schlein and H-T. Yau, Universality of sine-kernel for Wigner matrices with a small Gaussian perturbation, *arXiv:0905.2089*.
- [13] L. Erdős, J. Ramirez, B. Schlein and H-T. Yau, Bulk universality for Wigner matrices, *arXiv:0905.4176*
- [14] L. Erdős, B. Schlein, H-T. Yau and J. Yin, The local relaxation flow approach to universality of the local statistics for random matrices, *arXiv:0911.3687*.
- [15] L. Erdős, J. Ramirez, B. Schlein, T. Tao, V. Vu, and H-T. Yau, Bulk universality for Wigner hermitian matrices with subexponential decay, *to appear in Math. Res. Lett.*
- [16] L. Erdős, H-T. Yau and J. Yin, Bulk Universality for generalized Wigner Matrices, preprint.
- [17] L. Erdős, H-T. Yau and J. Yin, Rigidity of Eigenvalues of Generalized Wigner Matrices, preprint.
- [18] O. N. Feldheim and S. Sodin, A universality result for the smallest eigenvalues of certain sample covariance matrices, *preprint*.
- [19] P. J. Forrester, The spectrum edge of random matrix ensembles, *Nuclear Phys. B* **402** (1993), 709–728.
- [20] P. J. Forrester, Exact results and universal asymptotics in the Laguerre random matrix ensemble, *J. Math. Phys.* **35** (1994), no. 5, 2539–2551.
- [21] P. J. Forrester, N. S. Witte, The distribution of the first eigenvalue spacing at the hard edge of the Laguerre unitary ensemble, *Kyushu J. Math.* **61** (2007), no. 2, 457–526.
- [22] J. Ginibre, Statistical Ensembles of Complex, Quaternion, and Real Matrices, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **6** (1965), 440–449.
- [23] F. Götze, A. Tikhomirov, Rate of convergence to the semi-circular law, SFB343 Universität Bielefeld, Preprint 00-125 (2000), 1–24.
- [24] F. Götze, A. Tikhomirov, Rate of convergence in probability to the Marchenko-Pastur law, *Bernoulli* **10** (2004), no. 3, 503–548.
- [25] A. Guionnet and O. Zeitouni, Concentration of the spectral measure for large matrices, *Electron. Comm. Probab.* **5** (2000), 119–136 (electronic).
- [26] J. Gustavsson, Gaussian fluctuations of eigenvalues in the GUE, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **41** (2005), no. 2, 151–178.
- [27] K. Johansson, Universality of the local spacing distribution in certain ensembles of Hermitian Wigner matrices, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **215** (2001), no. 3, 683–705.
- [28] I. Johnstone, On the distribution of largest principal component, *Ann. Statist.* **29**, 2001.
- [29] N. Katz and P. Sarnak, Random matrices, Frobenius eigenvalues, and monodromy. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 45. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
- [30] M. Ledoux, The concentration of measure phenomenon, Mathematical survey and monographs, volume 89, AMS 2001.
- [31] J. W. Lindeberg, Eine neue Herleitung des Exponentialgesetzes in der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung, *Math. Z.* **15** (1922), 211–225.
- [32] V. A. Marchenko, L. A. Pastur, The distribution of eigenvalues in certain sets of random matrices, *Mat. Sb.* **72** (1967), 507–536.

- [33] M.L. Mehta, Random Matrices and the Statistical Theory of Energy Levels, Academic Press, New York, NY, 1967.
- [34] M.L. Mehta and M. Gaudin, On the density of eigenvalues of a random matrix, *Nuclear Phys.* **18** (1960), 420–427.
- [35] T. Nagao, K. Slevin, Laguerre ensembles of random matrices: nonuniversal correlation functions, *J. Math. Phys.* **34** (1993), no. 6, 2317–2330.
- [36] T. Nagao, M. Wadati, Correlation functions of random matrix ensembles related to classical orthogonal polynomials, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **60** (1991), no. 10, 3298–3322.
- [37] V. Paulauskas and A. Rackauskas, Approximation theory in the central limit theorem, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.
- [38] L. A. Pastur, Spectra of random self-adjoint operators. *Russian Math. Surveys*, **28**(1) (1973), 1–67.
- [39] S. Péché, Universality in the bulk of the spectrum for complex sample covariance matrices, preprint.
- [40] B. Rider, J. Ramirez, Diffusion at the random matrix hard edge, *to appear in Comm. Math. Phys.*
- [41] A. Soshnikov, Universality at the edge of the spectrum in Wigner random matrices, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **207** (1999), no. 3, 697–733.
- [42] A. Soshnikov, Gaussian limit for determinantal random point fields, *Ann. Probab.* **30** (1) (2002) 171–187.
- [43] A. Soshnikov, A note on universality of the distribution of the largest eigenvalues in certain sample covariance matrices, *J. Statist. Phys.* **108** (2002), no. 5-6, 1033–1056.
- [44] M. Talagrand, A new look at independence, *Ann. Probab.* **24** (1996), no. 1, 1–34.
- [45] T. Tao and V. Vu, On random 1 matrices: singularity and determinant, *Random Structures Algorithms* **28** (2006), no. 1, 1–23.
- [46] T. Tao and V. Vu (with an appendix by M. Krishnapur), Random matrices: Universality of ESDs and the circular law, *to appear in Annals of Probability*.
- [47] T. Tao and V. Vu, Random matrices: The distribution of the smallest singular values (Universality at the Hard Edge), *To appear in GAFA*.
- [48] , T. Tao and V. Vu, Random matrices: The local statistics of eigenvalues, *to appear in Acta Math.*
- [49] T. Tao and V. Vu, Random matrices: universality of local eigenvalue statistics up to the edge, *to appear in Comm. Math. Phys.*
- [50] J. von Neumann and H. Goldstine, Numerical inverting matrices of high order, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **53**, 1021–1099, 1947.
- [51] P. Wigner, On the distribution of the roots of certain symmetric matrices, *The Annals of Mathematics* **67** (1958) 325–327.
- [52] K. W. Wachter, Strong limits of random matrix spectra for sample covariance matrices of independent elements, *Ann. Probab.*, **6** (1978), 1–18.
- [53] Y. Q. Yin, Limiting spectral distribution for a class of random matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **20** (1986), 50–68.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UCLA, LOS ANGELES CA 90095-1555

E-mail address: tao@math.ucla.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RUTGERS, PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854

E-mail address: vanvu@math.rutgers.edu